REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. In light of the Office Action, the application has been carefully reviewed, and amended as necessary to place the application in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 3-5, 10, and 12-16 are amended.

Claim 2 is cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, because the term "simulated condition" is not defined in the specification, and the meaning of "first simulated condition" is indefinite. The terms "simulated condition" and "first simulated condition" in claims 1-19 have been amended to the terms "condition" and "first condition", respectively. Thus, the rejection as it applies to claims 1-19 is moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sarvar et al. (Effective Modeling of the Reflow Soldering Process: Basis, Construction, and Operation of a Process Model). Applicants respectfully disagree for at least the following reasons.

Regarding the amended claim 13, Sarvar does not disclose that analysis result data analyzed based on a plurality of conditions are generated at every step, and the executing portion executes the simulation of the second step by sampling the analysis result data generated based on the simulation condition. Since some of the limitations of claim 2 are incorporated into the amended claim 1, the following will discuss the reason for the rejection against claim 2. The Office action states in rejecting claim 2 that Sarvar discloses, "The output (analysis data) is

calculated during each temperature variation." However, there is no disclosure in Sarvar that the

executing step executes the simulation of the second step by sampling the output based on the

simulation condition. Therefore, since every limitation of claim 13 is not taught by the

reference, claim 13 is not fully anticipated by Sarvar. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it

applies to claim 13 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 1-12 and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Sarvar et al. ("Effective Modeling of the Reflow Soldering Process: Basis, Construction, and

Operation of a Process Model") in view of Ekere ("Solder Paste Printing Process Modeling

Map"). Applicants respectfully disagree for at least the following reasons.

Claim 2 has been cancelled. Thus, the rejection as it applies to claim 2 is moot.

Regarding claims 1 and 14, neither Sarvar nor Ekere, alone or in combination, discloses,

teaches or renders foreseeable that analysis result data analyzed based on a plurality of

conditions are generated at every step, and the second simulation executing step executes the

simulation of the second step by sampling the analysis result data generated based on the second

condition. For the same reason as claim 13, claims 1 and 14 should be allowable.

Claims 3-12 and 15-16 which are directly or indirectly dependent from claim 1 should

also be allowable for at least the same reason.

Claims 17-19 which are directly or indirectly dependent from claim 14 should also be

allowable for at least the same reason.

Page 11 of 13

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present

application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is

determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to

initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the

present application.

Appln. No. 10/767,658 Amendment dated May 4, 2009 In Response to Office Action dated February 5, 2009

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No.: NGB-36409.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By:

Nobuhiko Sukenaga, Reg. No. 39446

1801 East 9th Street Suite 1200 Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108 (216) 579-1700

Date: May 4, 2009